

# APRIL MINUTES

## REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, April 16, 2013 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Location: KCOEM, Training Room

### Attendance

Barnaby Dow (KCOEM), Craig Hurley (Covington Water), Denis Uhler (Overlake), Gail Harris (Shoreline), Janice Rahman (KCOEM), Kimberly Behymer (Kent), Mike Ryan (Zone 1), Monica Walker (KCDNR), Rick Wallace (VashonBePrepared), Bob Freitag (UW)

### Action items to be completed by committee members by next meeting:

1. Sam- Add column for non-meeting hours on sign-in sheet.
2. Rob- Recollect salaries with non-burden rate.
3. All- Check to see if we have GeoSpatial layer of HAZMAT (TIER II facilities)
4. Check for to see if Sound Transit is part of any other committee to get use of any maps they may have dealing with Hazards.
5. Rob- Other hazards -- subcommittee approach. Find what plans we have, which hazards we should use.
6. Rob- Start inventory of Critical Facilities. Let's utilize all the shapefiles of CF we can get. Let's import them all. KCDOT should have bridge data.
7. Sam- Send King County GIS contact information to Rob to get all shapefiles they have. Rob will send out excel spreadsheet, and have local areas sign off on facilities.
8. Janice- Send out draft Mission/value, people can edit it.
9. Group- Review public hazard/risk awareness survey.
10. Rob- Circulate updated critical facilities definition.

### Key highlights and decisions

Bob has agreed to write profile with Rob & be the steering committee's expert. **(Group consensus)**

Rob: I propose we have another hazards chapter. **(Group consensus)** As to what the other hazards are, do we want to leave that hanging and think about what hazards we want, what other plans there are?

Review of March Minutes to be approved via e-mail.

## **MEETING OPEN: 1:00 PM**

Meeting began with a welcome and introductions, and moved directly into agenda items, which covered the following:

- Risk assessment update
- Other hazards of concern
- Critical facilities
- Guiding principle/mission statement
- Public outreach

## **RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE**

Tetra Tech has acquired new county assessor information, will be updating datasets with this new information. The assessor data contains valuable metrics on square footage which will aid in calculating exposure.

**Earthquakes-** What scenarios do we want to use? We want to narrow it down, rather than including 15 different ones.

**HazMat:** If the committee is aware of any hazmat Tier 2 facilities data, please let Tetra Tech know. Currently we have a basic idea based off of assumptions of who (what business) occupies different facilities.

**Landslide:** DNR is in the process of updating their landslide data, DNR might also be a place to go for data on old mines. (Some jurisdictions identify abandoned mines as a local hazard)

DENIS - Will this include sinkholes?

ROB: landslide/mass movements - sinkholes will most likely be included in this group. (sink holes from mining)

## **OTHER HAZARDS OF CONCERN**

The mitigation plan must qualify FEMA standards, which require that we address natural hazards, but does not require attention to non-natural hazards. We are electing to include other hazards of concern, which may potentially include terrorism, hazmat, or others. One way to do address non-natural hazards is to create plan linkages to already existing plans within other departments, such as Public Health, which could address pandemics for example.

MIKE: Will cyber security be included?

BEV: We must be able to show impact from cyber security attack. You can profile it as much as you like, but you have to be able show impact (for mitigation).

GAIL: Critical infrastructure group has examples of cyber security attacks. Suggestions for finding examples of cyber security - WA Fusion Center & Critical Infrastructure group.

BEV: One option is to link other hazards of concern such as cyber-attack to the Threat/Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA). Perhaps the mitigation plan for natural hazards, and the THIRA for non-natural hazards.

ROB: In addition, profiling non naturals with show that King County has considered them even if they aren't addressed to the extent of natural hazards.

GAIL: It is a good idea to link non-natural hazards to the plans surrounding them. We don't know the unique threats around the Port of Seattle, for example, but we could just document that the port has plans in place for threats relevant to them.

RICK: Is the purpose of this document (The mitigation plan) just to serve of process of acquiring federal funding? If so, shouldn't we just say that?

GAIL: Having mitigation plan in place doesn't mean we *will* apply for FEMA money, but it does give a roadmap as to how and to what the money will be best spent on.

ROB: This is a risk reduction plan, designed to reduce the harmful effects from frequent and impactful events on communities.

ROB: I propose we have another hazards chapter. **(Group consensus)** As to what the other hazards are, do we want to leave that hanging and think about what hazards we want, what other plans there are?

BEV: Non-natural hazards can be an extensive list, as there are many options. Addressing it could take 50 pages.

ROB/DENIS: We wouldn't be addressing each, just linking to existing plans.

GAIL: For hazards we don't have a lot of information on, we could profile and set the table for a new action (Such as a Cyber Attack plan).

BEV: Do we put the plans we have in the capabilities section? Or do we profile them? If there aren't actually plans that relate to a certain hazard, they couldn't go in the capabilities section, since there technically would not be that capability.

JANICE: Other hazards need to be in same outline as the natural hazards. We want to avoid having inconsistent format.

## **Climate Change**

ROB/BOB FREITAG: We agree that climate change needs to be addressed, not necessary as a hazard but as an outcome. This should include the basics of climate change, how it works, and it's impacts on hazards. Every hazard is impacted by climate change in some way or another, and this can range from

global down to regional. Bob has agreed to write profile with Rob & be the steering committee's expert.  
**(Group consensus)**

GAIL: Shoreline's mitigation plan talked about how climate change impacts vulnerable populations. Recommend this be in the King County plan as well.

BEV: Each hazard section will have a place where impacts the public are addressed.

RICK: Will you acknowledge the causes of climate change or just acknowledge that it is happening?

BOB FRIETAG: Only 32 scientists say that climate change isn't caused by man. At some point we need to acknowledge that climate change is being caused by humans.

### **CRITICAL FACILITIES**

The mitigation plan addresses critical facilities, but to do that we must define them. We can take two routes in defining critical facilities. One is to accept the FEMA definition, but you can short change yourself here because when you apply for grants or public assistance you must use their definition. Alternatively, we can create our own, which allows us to broaden the definition to more accurately reflect jurisdictional needs. King County already has a definition in place for critical facilities, as outlined in Title 16 of the King County Critical Areas ordinance. Ultimately the point is to define places that would benefit from mitigation projects within the scope of critical facilities.

GAIL: I like the King County critical facilities definition, as it is inclusive to buildings we will need to use during an emergency, but aren't necessarily traditional critical facilities.

GROUP: Generally like the definition of critical facilities used in the Contra Costa plan.

DENIS: Contra Costa definition doesn't have large universities or stadiums.

BEV: State (like a university) and federal facilities will not be done in the threat assessment, as they are covered by other plans, but we do need to acknowledge them as critical facilities.

GAIL/RICK: Fairgrounds, campgrounds and other gathering places should be included as well.

ROB: Will take the Contra Costa definition, add the groups' recommendations, and circulate via email to the steering committee.

MIKE: Is there a difference of essential and critical? Essential facilities might have second options, rather than being the only facility to serve that purpose. How do we address the difference?

ROB: Loss of a critical facility will cause impacts, i.e. HazMat sites.

MIKE: For grant purposes, does it matter if the facility is public or private?

ROB/BEV: You can grant such a project, but it must be agreed upon by the owner of the property and the county assumes the grant match.

GAIL: If you know you have a critical facility building that is NOT built to standards, this must be communicated in the plan.

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

### **Website**

An initial launch of the website will be made viewable to steering committee members within the month.

### **Survey**

ROB: Take a look at the provided example survey for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans. The survey is designed to help gauge the public's opinion of risk, so go through it and mark what you like and what you don't like, or what needs to be asked. This survey will eventually be on the King County website.

## **GUIDING PRINCIPLES/MISSION STATEMENT**

We don't have to complete a set of guiding principles or a mission statement, but it can become a theme for public outreach. This can be simple or long, it's up to the committee. Ultimately, guiding principles or a mission statement can be used to feed the creation of goals, objectives and actions that are all in alignment.

JANICE: We need to make sure we have a mission & value that applies to THIS plan. The current one could apply to any plan. We want this to be specific to hazard mitigation.

## **ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned at 2:58 PM